

REVUE DES ÉTUDES SLAVES

TOME QUATRE-VINGT-HUITIÈME

Fascicule 4

**1914, l'Autriche-Hongrie entre en guerre
Récits de soldats et de civils**



PARIS

2017

**PARIS OR WEIMAR? * HUNGARIAN WRITERS'
AND INTELLECTUALS' EARLY DILEMMAS
in the construction of their *war culture* during WWI**

Eszter BALÁZS

*Assistant professor, University of Applied Arts János Kodolányi
Researcher Kassák Museum–Petőfi Literary Museum*

Like many intellectuals in Europe, Hungarian writers and intellectuals took part in the mobilization of intellect in their country and created their own *war culture* from the beginning of WWI. And, like the *war culture* of many Hungarian politicians and of the mass press, it was based on hatred. At the beginning of the conflict, many Hungarian writers and intellectuals of all ideological persuasions offered their pens and their words to blame or even reject the enemy culture, especially French culture. Expressing anti-French sentiments became part of the battle of words—in multiple ways and to varying degrees, according to intellectuals' journals and groups—and for some periodicals it remained an important topic right until the second part of the war when Hungarian public opinion was gradually turning (not without fluctuation) from battlefield news towards peace. This study looks at those authors and journals involved in creating their *war culture* through the criticism of France and French culture during the first mobilization years (1914-1915).

In WWI, the considerable decrease in autonomy due to the reversing of the art rules¹ went hand-in-hand with a closely related phenomenon described by Aviel Roshwald and Richard Stites like this:

This cross-continental retreat from foreign soil was a kinetic parallel to the intellectual abandonment of 'alien' inspiration.²

* See below Béla Balázs's essay with the same title. This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

1. Nicolas Beaupré, *Écrire en guerre, écrire la guerre. France, Allemagne, 1914-1920*, Paris, CNRS, 2006, p. 50.

2. Aviel Roshwald, Richard Stites (eds.), Conclusion. In *ibid.*, *European culture in the Great War. The arts, entertainment and propaganda, 1914-1918*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 351.

However, rather than a total abandonment of foreign inspirations, we could claim that every belligerent nation was trying to reevaluate its foreign inspirations of the prewar period to such an extent that—at least at the beginning of the conflict—the perception of foreign cultures became mainly or exclusively geopolitical, related to the polarity between friend and foe. During the first mobilization years (1914-1915), the enemy's culture was generally devalued or ignored while allies' culture was over-valued in the national cultural self-definition. Likewise, in Hungary, the interpretation of foreign cultures and literatures took place in a more or less exclusive geopolitical frame at the beginning of the conflict and French culture and literature became part of this geopolitical re-evaluation process.³ However, as Michel Espagne and Michael Werner point out, political changes may have a more or less important influence on cultural exchanges, but they interfere with other impacts too. WWI is a good example where geopolitical arguing was often mixed up with reviving old antagonisms and stereotypes defined by political as well as intellectual trends in the past. Espagne and Werner also emphasize the importance of individuals and groups in transferring ideas, representations and cultural objects. Due to the total character of WWI and the closing of the borders, the number of persons to pass through the frontiers decreased significantly; some mobility, as one important element of any cultural exchange, remained, however, but—at least at the beginning—only towards allied countries and, to some extent, towards neutral ones. Ideas and objects could also cross the borders with difficulty.

In addition, there was a general paradox related to cultural antagonism during WWI: while the significant decrease in cultural exchanges marked a profound disintegration process of an intellectual and cultural Europe in the making since the 1880s,⁴ writers and intellectuals, thinking in terms of “civilization” against “barbarism” (all wanted to defend ‘civilization’ against the perceived ‘barbarity’ of the enemy), claimed for themselves a leading or a more important role than they had had before on the cultural scene in Europe. Accordingly, when criticizing France during 1914-1915, many Hungarian writers and intellectuals also thought (explicitly or implicitly) in terms of a French-German Kulturwar to take over the leadership of Europe in intellectual and cultural matters and where Hungarians could find a new, less marginal position than they thought had before the conflict.⁵

3. The intellectuals' *war culture* was a system of representations originating from the war, with a special focus on the hatred. See on *war culture* in general: Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, Annette Becker, *1914-1918 Understanding the Great War*, London, Profile Books, 2002, p. 102-103.

4. Christophe Prochasson, *Az értelmiség és Európa a 19-20. században* [Intellectuals and Europe, 19th-20th centuries], *Múltunk*, No. 1, 2005, p. 206-269. epa.oszk.hu/00900/00995/00001/pdf/prochasson.pdf

5. Art critic Zoltán Felvinczi Takács stressed for example that, “since we Hungarians have been belonging to the West, we follow the path showed by the Germans.” Ibid., “A magyarok és a németek” [Hungarians and Germans], *Nyugat*, No. 21, 1 Nov. 1914, p. 450.

DIVISION OF LABOR IN THE HATRED OF THE ENEMIES

The Hungarian mass press and public opinion were dominated by anti-Serbian sentiments during the first months of WWI and even in the following period, along with anti-Russian ones for obvious political and military reasons. Anti-French or anti-British sentiments, due to the lack of common battlefields, were of secondary importance for the majority of Hungarians. Accordingly, there were great differences regarding hatred and atrocities against enemy civilians on Hungarian soil.⁶ Since the assassination of the archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife, Serbians and Romanians had changed place, moving to the top of the list of Hungary's enemies,⁷ and the Serbian population in Hungarian territory had been harassed in various ways, officially and non-officially. Although the rights of French or British citizens were restricted, they were not, unlike Serbians, harassed in the streets, and they were significantly much less interned, too.⁸

Along with the dominant hatred of Serbs in the public sphere, some anti-French sentiments were also expressed in scenes of urban culture at the beginning of the war: on the 18-19th of August 1914, the *Jardin d'Hiver* and the *Jardin de Paris*, two Orpheums in Budapest performing cabaret, were renamed to Téli Kert and Berlini Kert—direct Hungarian translation or transformation of the former French names.⁹ Many retailers, more particularly fashion shops or restaurants, as well as the Parisiana movie theater in Budapest were renamed too.¹⁰ Even menus got new Hungarian appellations in the Budapest Ritz.¹¹ These practices—concerning not only French, but also English appellations in Hungary¹²—were in harmony with similar renaming all over in Europe.¹³ So there was a division of labor in the hatred of the enemy: while the Hungarian mass press and public opinion were dominated by anti-Russian and anti-Serbian sentiments, writers and intellectuals were concerned with adapting a new geopolitical approach to France and French culture in their journals.

6. Nevertheless, there already exists considerable literature on atrocities against Serbian civilians in Serbia during WWI.

7. András Gerő, "Békéből háborúba" [From Peace to War] in Ibid. (szerk.), *Merénylettől hadüzenetig. A béke utolsó hónapja a Monarchia Magyarországon (1914. június 28.-1914. július 28.)* [The Last Month of Peace in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy], Budapest, Első Világháborús Centenárium Emlékbizottság – Habsburg Történeti Intézet, 2014, 8.

8. On internments in France and in Hungary, see a general presentation by László Somogyi. Magyar állampolgárok francia internálótáborokban az első világháború alatt [Hungarian citizens in French internment camps during WWI] ujkor.hu/content/magyar-allampolgarok-francia-internalotaborokban-az-első-vilaghaboru-alatt. On French and British citizens in Hungary, see decree No. 2438/1915 (*Belügyi Közlöny* [Bulletin of Ministry of Interior], 31 Jan. 1915, p. 46-47).

9. Zsófia Bán, "Augusztusi láz – 'Hát végre!'" [The Fever of August 1914 – "Finally!"], *Magyar Lettre Internationale*, No. 93, summer 2014, p. 12.

10. Boldizsár Vörös, "Nemzeti Park, Vilmos Császár út és a Hősök tere. Háborús névadások Budapesten 1914-1918 között" [National Park, Av. Emperor William and the Heroes Square. Renaming in Budapest during WWI], *Médiakutató*, No. 1, 2010, p. 118, 120.

11. Ibid.

12. Hungary means in every case the Hungarian part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

13. See for example Roland N. Stromberg, *Redemption by War: The Intellectuals and 1914*, Lawrence, The Regents Press of Kansas, 1982, p. 138.

MODERATE HATRED ON POLITICAL BASIS: LIBERAL-CONSERVATIVE
WRITERS, CLOSE TO THE AUTHORITIES

One could suppose that anti-French reactions on the part of literary and intellectual press close to the political authorities were obvious from the very beginning due to their strong loyalty to the national cause and war effort. Nevertheless, by taking a closer look at the journals, a more nuanced and perhaps surprising picture can be drawn. In *Magyar Figyelő* (Hungarian Observer), the major pro-establishment intellectual review (characterized by an inclusive version of nationalism before the conflict), hatred towards the enemy was never excessive (not even at the beginning). Apart from some early writings by the novelist Ferenc Herczeg, the journal's editor-in-chief and personal friend of Prime Minister István Tisza, the journal did not want to arouse passions to the maximum. Until March 1915, when the great Carpathian battles began against the Russians on the Eastern front, it rather emphasized the heroism of Hungarians and appreciated the allies, more particularly the Germans, and did not criticize the enemies excessively. This low-profile was well suited to the discourse on a defensive war based on dismissing the accusations of "barbarism" plaguing Germany from the beginning of the conflict, since the violation of Belgium's neutrality in early August 1914 arousing a significant anti-German campaign in the entente and neutral press.¹⁴ Using this political strategy of rejecting (excessive) hatred of the enemy, they thought they could differentiate themselves just from these very enemies: in other words, being moderates, they could appear "civilized," while their enemies, sunk in hatred, appeared automatically as "barbarians." This discourse particularly fitted with the self-image of central powers willing to represent themselves as true civilians in comparison with France and Britain, whose prevailing popular image, unlike that of Russia, was just of the "leader of civilized nations."¹⁵ (German low profile facing France was further remarked in autumn 1914 by Hungarians,¹⁶ but did not mitigate hatred towards France in Hungary in a general way. Hungarian writers close to the authorities seem to have adapted best to this low profile strategy.)

Another reason for the liberal-conservative writers' moderation was that, while in the authoritarian and semi-constitutional Germany, mainly writers and intellectuals (who formed the sole group accustomed to having political discus-

14. See more on this discourse in Hungary: Eszter Balázs, "'War Stares At Us Like an Ominous Sphynx'. Hungarian Intellectuals, Literature and the Image of the Other (1914-1915)," in: Lawrence Rosenthal, Vesna Rodic (eds.), *The New Nationalism and the First World War*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, p. 100.

15. One of the major polemics in the most important pedagogical review, *Népművelés* (Cultivation of People), run mainly by similar liberal conservative intellectuals, was whether French schools had been educating children for hatred since before 1914, and subsequently what the profile of the Hungarian school should be in wartime.

16. *Világ* reported already in October 1914 that the French were no longer hated in Berlin. Artúr Bárdos, "A franciákra nem haragszunk..." [We don't hate the French...], *Világ*, No. 262, 20 Oct. 1914, p. 7.

sions and debates) created a *war culture* to express war hatred (the mass press was not very keen on it),¹⁷ in the Hungarian part of the Monarchy—where liberty of expression was an established custom since 1867—the mass press also took part in the creation of a *war culture*, along with writers and intellectuals. So the latter—whether close to the establishment or not—did not feel alone, unlike their German counterparts, in forming a general *war culture*, and consequently could express more or less divergent opinions. Similarly to the German establishment, by doing this pro-establishment writers and intellectuals wanted to avoid democratic “consequences” of any excessive agitation of the people, too.

SUCCESSFUL FRENCH BOOKS IN HUNGARY DESPITE OR BECAUSE OF WWI

Many other publications, however, revealed ambivalences regarding new assessment of France and French culture at the beginning of WWI: *Új Idők* (Modern Times), another liberal-conservative (literary) journal,¹⁸ also kept publishing translations from French literature for its mostly female readers despite its patriotic stance—such as works by the aged Georges Ohnet or the already old-fashioned François Coppée—by arguing that they analyzed the “French spirit,” which was necessary in time of crisis. *Új Idők* republished *Panin Sergius* during the conflict and even offered a discount to its subscribers.¹⁹ During the first year of the conflict, the greatest French book success in Hungary was undoubtedly the *Assault of Paris* by Francisque Sarcey (first published in French in 1871); it was published three times by Singer and Wolfner (twice in 1914) and sold three thousand copies in September–October 1914 alone.²⁰ According to an advertisement from 27 September 1914, Sarcey’s novel was “the most topical, the most interesting, the most clever and the newest book” in the Hungarian book market.²¹ However, its success was only relative because of the very bad conditions of the Hungarian book market since the outbreak of the conflict and because, initially, the Hungarian war literature was very poor. According to this same advertisement, the events of the war in 1870–1871 as

17. Jean-Jacques Becker, Gerd Krumeich, *la Grande Guerre. Une histoire franco-allemande*, Paris, Tallandier, (coll. Texto), 2012, p. 106.

18. *Új Idők* was a literary journal close to the Tisza government thanks to its editor-in-chief, the Ferenc Herczeg mentioned above, but with more explicit cultural and literary interests and targeting mostly women. Since its creation (1894), it had combined the mediation of French culture with Hungarian nationalism.

19. Anonymous, “Közkedvelt regények” [Toplisted Books], *Új Idők*, No. 19, 2 May 1915, p. 483.; Eds., “A kiadóhivatal üzenetei” [Messages of the Editor], *Új Idők*, No. 10, 28 Febr. 1915, p. 250.

20. Francisque Sarcey, *Páris ostroma. Benyomások és élmények*, 1st and 2nd editions (1914); 3rd edition (1915). Sarcey’s work had been well known by the Hungarian French-speaking public since its first Hungarian edition in French (Pozsony (Bratislava) / Budapest, Stampfel, 1901). One can find several ads on the 1914 editions giving sale rates as well.

21. Advertisement, No. 9, 27 Sept. 1914, *Új Idők*. The anniversary of Sedan – victory of the Germans over the French in 1871 and birth of the *Reich* – was celebrated also in Hungary on 2 September. See for example Diary of Laura Lengyel (4 Sept. 1914), *Holmi*, No. 11, 2014, p. 1310.

described in Sarcey's novel would be repeated,²² which was very telling about early war expectations in Hungary. In early 1915, Sarcey's novel was even claimed to be one of the greatest book success in the Hungarian book market since the beginning of WWI; at the least it was among the five most important works on the current conflict according to *Új Idők*²³ and published in the freshly launched series: *A nagy háború könyvei* (The books of the Great War).²⁴

Thanks to surveys by the review *Könyvtári Szemle* (Library Observatory) we know about the Budapest public's reading choices during the first months, including choices of foreign novels.²⁵ Authors include Hugo, Croker, Daudet, Doyle, Ohnet, Wells, Tolstoy and Zola. On one hand, due to a lack of war literature in Hungarian at the beginning of the conflict, Budapest people turned to foreign authors on the subject. On the other, WWI could not alter reading habits overnight, on account of several circumstances: the national publishing industry came to a halt (until late 1914 it was dying), transportation from abroad significantly decreased, and readers were short of money to buy books.²⁶ Libraries' book acquisitions completely stopped from the Entente countries. Acquisitions by the Central Library of Budapest were German books and periodicals at the beginning of the conflict,²⁷ but later on it got in touch with the Dutch book merchant Martinus Nijhoff and the Swiss-Italian company Olschki, in order to continue to procure French and English books and reviews. However, censorship of these publications would only be stopped by the Prime Minister himself, István Tisza, during the first months of 1915.²⁸ Via these new channels, journals and publications from Entente countries or from occupied Belgium could reach the country, including *Les Débris de la guerre* de Mæterlinck and *Parmi les cendres* de Verhaeren.²⁹ So while an important part of the Hungarian literary press was aroused in cultural hatred and very often in anti-French sentiments, at least at the beginning of the conflict, readers in the capital spheres kept their own preferences for reading foreign novels, including French ones, at their home or in libraries, about war or not.

The theme of Paris under assault was a quite popular subject at the very beginning of the war, not only in books but also in journals. Géza Laczkó, describing himself as a neophyte patriot who confessed to his diary having had before the conflict a "French soul full of hatred of the Germans,"³⁰ translated letters by

22. Advertisement, No. 9, 27 Sept. 1914, *Új Idők*.

23. Eds., "A kiadóhivatal üzenetei," art. cit.

24. See ads of *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 3, 1915.

25. Ed., "Olvasókedv a háború alatt" [Reading customs during the war], *Könyvtári Szemle*, July-Dec. 1914, p. 215.

26. István Bárczy, "Irodalom és főváros" [Literature and the Capital of Hungary], *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 4, 16 Feb. 1915, p. 275.

27. László Remete (szerk.), *A Fővárosi Szabó Ervin könyvtár története* [History of FSZEK Library], Budapest, FSZEK, 1966, p. 159.

28. Ibid, p. 158.

29. Ibid., p. 171-172.

30. Diary of Géza Laczkó, *Holmi*, No. 11, 2014, p. 1314.

Gustave Flaubert from the period of 1870-1871 in the modernist review *Nyugat* (on *Nyugat* see below) because he found that the situation of the French then and now to be—mutatis mutandis—quite similar, and Flaubert's letters shed light on current events as well. The subject of the encircled French capital did not disappear totally after the first years of the war: even in September 1916, the writer Lajos Barta reviewed in *Nyugat* a German booklet on the siege of Paris in 1870-1871 (*Paris 1870-1871. Stimmen aus der belagerten Stadt*, Berlin, Verlag Ullstein & Co., 1916), collecting excerpts from various French novels describing the siege of Paris in 1870-1871.³¹

EXCESSIVE HATRED ON MORAL BASIS: CATHOLICS

While periodicals close to the political establishment tried to appear moderate regarding the enemy, or at least regarding Western enemies and their culture for obvious political reasons, harsh attacks—not surprisingly—came from the Catholic cultural press. Similarly to many European Catholic journals, this one was traditionally hostile to French republicanism and democracy and blamed them for modern lifestyles, materialism and individualism. The ultra-conservative congregational monthly *Magyar Kultúra* (Hungarian Culture), founded by the Jesuit priest Béla Bagha, and the literary weekly *Élet* (Life) laid great emphasis on new values created by the war. Both journals wrote about a modern “crusade,” where Germany and its allies must fight in the West and the East against ‘the spirit of religion turned into superstition’ and the “godlessness that diverts from Christianity.” Obviously, the first criticism concerned Russia; the second France.³²

These journals devoted many pages to describing the Kulturwar between the two enemy camps, and made frequent references to French “low morals.” In their eyes, France had been subversive both in political and cultural terms since before the war. A number of anti-values were listed since August 1914: promiscuity, immorality, pornography, frivolity and so forth. Verbal abuse used by these journals was typical of anti-modernist and anti-feminist discourses. According to the Catholic novelist János Anka, war was a struggle between cultures and morals: German impeccable religious morals were fighting “the worms of culture.” “The paint of decadent French culture peeled off from us in these times of earthquake so we could take clothes of iron,” he said.³³ Elsewhere, France was compared to “an aging, washed-out lady, whose silken dress is covered with mud.”³⁴ Anti-French sentiments were closely related to the aesthetics of violence in these journals.

31. Lajos Barta, “A körülzárt Paris” [Encircled Paris], *Nyugat*, No. 18, 16 Sept. 1916, p. 428-430.

32. Albert Apponyi, “A mi háborunk” [Our War], *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 13, 5 Sept. 1914, p. 4-8; Ernő Margitay, “Válságok” [Crisis], *Élet*, No. 38, 20 Sept. 1914, p. 1125. See about these first reactions of literary and cultural journals in general: Eszter Balázs, “War Stares At Us Like an Ominous Sphinx,” op. cit., p. 95-121.

33. János Anka, “Világtörténet” [World History], *Élet*, No. 34, 23 August 1914, p. 1041.

34. Anonymous, “Francia erkölcs” [French Morals], *Élet*, No. 32, 9 August 1914, p. 1014.

Another typical means for ultraconservative Catholics to criticize French culture was linking French products, both intellectual and popular, to so-called “low culture” in order to depreciate them; this was, at the time, a widely popular elitist technique among conservatives and ultraconservatives in the whole Western world. Addressing booksellers, the critic Péter Nagy called in *Magyar Kultúra* for a boycott on “French outmoded literary delicacies” on the pattern of a planned boycott of French commercial products by Hungarian merchants.³⁵ He condemned fashion, theatre, arts and low reproduction rate as immoral and suggested a “guerrilla combat” to defend Hungary against all these evils. While the journal disdained French modernist writers, at the same time, in October 1914, French Catholic provincial writers such as Frédéric Mistral were still praised.³⁶

THE VOLTE-FACE AND THE SUBSEQUENT SILENCE OF UNIVERSALIST FRANCOPHILES

What is surprising in terms of anti-French sentiments is the fact that another wave of hatred of France and French culture in August 1914 came not from pro-establishment literary journals, but from “autonomist” ones, which had been known for their cultural Francophilia and even for an antiwar stance before WWI. But since the outbreak of the conflict they had lost much of their independence along with their Francophilia. Seemingly, they made a complete withdrawal by criticizing France and French culture during the first weeks, but the majority of these writers and intellectuals often adopted the voice of the betrayed lover, hinting at their (previous) positive feelings toward France and French culture.

The autonomous literary review *Nyugat* (West) and the progressive daily *Világ*³⁷ (World) were very active during the August fever and the following months in creating their *war culture* via a specific cultural critical discourse which became popular among intellectuals all over in Europe: the discourse opposing “words” and “deeds.”³⁸ Many of their contributors, writers and intellectuals, were thirsty for action; however, this fervor stirred by the war was blended with doubts and fears. They also hoped that the force of the war would

35. Péter Nagy, “A Magyar Könyvtár újabb fejezetei” [The newest chapters of the series ‘Hungarian Library’], *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 13, 5 Sept. 1914, p. 34–36 (quotation: p. 35); d. f. [Ferenc Döry], “A francia áruk bojkottja” [Boycott of French products], *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 15, 5 Oct. 1914, p. 170–171. A movement against French products [Francia áruk ellen való bojkottmozgalom] unifying 140 Hungarian merchants and craftsmen was formed in late August 1914 in Budapest.

36. Maupassant was named, for example, “poet of the rotten Gallic spirit.” (–k. [Ernő Császár], Brandes, *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 15, 5 Oct. 1914, p. 162.); For the obituary of Mistral: Zsolt Alszegehy, “Frédéric Mistral (1830–1914),” *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 15, 5 Oct. 1914, p. 143–147.

37. Both had to make a complete withdrawal since they had been entirely anti-war till WWI broke out.

38. For the Hungarian case: see Eszter Balázs, “Szó és cselekvés kettőssége, értelmiségellenesség, értelmiségi felelősség Magyarországon az első világháború elején” [Words vs. Deeds. Anti-intellectualism and the question of intellectuals’ responsibility in Hungary at early of WWI], *Múltunk*, No. 2, 2016, p. 4–54.

revitalize artistic activity and the relationship of war and literature became a burning topic. Many of them also expressed serious dilemmas regarding France and French culture. Their discourse on France was the most complex discourse on hatred in the whole Hungarian intellectual life.

FROM "FAREWELL TO PARIS" IN *VILÁG* TO A DIALECTICAL
INTERPRETATION OF FRANCE AND FRENCH CULTURE IN *NYUGAT*

Universalist Francophiles turned their back on France and French culture because they anticipated a short war and a rapid victory of the Germans on the Western front, and they wanted to prevent any possible accusations of being a Francophile when their country was at war with France. Like many writers and artists from a Central European background, numerous Hungarian writers and intellectuals (and not only universalist Francophiles) had visited the "cultural Mecca" since the end of the 19th century.³⁹ It is clear that, for many of them, it was complicated to express their opinion on France or French culture when WWI broke out. So many of these writers adopted the voice of the betrayed lover, but once the August fever ended, they preferred to fall silent about France. The progressive daily *Világ* even published an editorial during the first days of August expressing disappointment in Paris in the voice of the betrayed lover: "Causing a harmful depression [...] France is alien to us," however "it had led the true culture for centuries."⁴⁰ The anonymous author (probably Lajos Purjesz, editor-in-chief) said goodbye on behalf of an entire generation who 'had turned to Paris with its entire soul'.⁴¹ But this link was broken in the storm of the war and the next generations of artists and fans would look at more at Berlin than at Paris since the Parisian culture fashion was over: "We are crying for the Paris we have just lost." To have an idea of nuances, let us quote *Budapesti Hírlap*, a conservative daily that also welcomed the changing position of the French capital for Hungarians but by using a different rhetoric: "Paris had always been the Eldorado of desires that we, non-objective Hungarians, preferred to see as the world capital," and it is still a goal in the war but no longer of Hungarians' journeys to see human achievements, but rather of German soldiers to "teach a panicky people having lost its morals to honor justice and humanity."⁴² The conservative *Budapesti Hírlap* (and other major papers) also joined the Catholic press in condemnation of Republicanism (that was supposed to destroy France) and in praise of the monarchy. However, not all of their journalists agreed with

39. Maria Delapierre, Antoine Marès (eds.), "Paris 'capitale culturelle' de l'Europe centrale?" *les Échanges intellectuels entre la France et les pays de l'Europe médiane, 1918-1939*, Paris, Institut d'études slaves (Cultures et sociétés de l'Est), 1997, p. 7.

40. Ed., "Budapest és Páris" [Budapest and Paris], *Világ*, No. 181, 1 August 1914, p. 10.

41. According to the author, French authors were most read at private homes and more and more Hungarians were learning French as well – this remark corresponds to the fact that, despite the progress of English, French and German were still major languages of openness of the Hungarians towards the West.

42. Ed., "Előre" [Ahead!], *Budapesti Hírlap*, No. 189, 9 August 1914, p. 1.

that: Laura Lengyel refused such a one-sided explanation lacking reason and fairness regarding France in her diary and expressed her fear of the “Junker spirit.”⁴³

Farewell to Paris was an important topic in *Világ*: in the same tone as the editor-in-chief in *Világ*, Ignóty, a great critic and publicist of his time and editor-in-chief of the modernist review *Nyugat*, said goodbye to all the enemy capitals a couple of days later in *Világ* in his regular column on 9 August.⁴⁴ The day before, the author of the editorial had justified the Germans’ war as a “cultural force” and a “cultural responsibility” after the German victory at Liège.⁴⁵ At the same time, *Világ* also reported on the Hungarian merchants’ plan to boycott French products.⁴⁶ However, in the following weeks, Ignóty (along with other authors) criticized Russia much more than France and stressed in many articles a justified war against its despotism in the name of democracy and liberalism, which was a typical argument of Hungarian liberal and leftist authors in the first years of WWI.⁴⁷

This withdrawal of universalist Francophiles did not remain unnoticed by contemporaries. In the political and literary weekly *Új Nemzedék* (New Generation) – a partisan of universal suffrage, but very eclectic, including anti-Semitic sentiments – the critic László Márkus asked ironically if “several illustrious personages of our literature seriously believe that Rodin, Anatole France, Paul Claudel, Rostand or [Henry] Bataille truly play an important role in French brutalities.”⁴⁸ He had the answer ready on the basis of nationalism and anti-Semitism: those blaming France now used to praise French culture along with Jewish culture before the conflict, so they are only turncoats who want to hide their real identity behind the mask of the national self-awareness (he also named specifically the publishing house Singer and Wolfner, run by assimilated Jews and publisher of the already-mentioned liberal-conservative pro-war weekly *Új Idők*). This article was one of the very few to prove that anti-French and anti-Semitic sentiments could merge together in Hungary during WWI. In

43. Diary of Laura Lengyel (19 August, 2 Sept., 5 Sept. 1914), op. cit., p. 1306, 1309, 1311.

44. Ignóty, “Búcsú” [Farewell], *Világ*, No. 189, 9 August 1914, p. 5-8. Ilona Bölöni was disappointed by the belligerence of Ignóty, who epitomized the objective, nuanced critic before WWI. Laura Lengyel was disappointed too. Diary of Laura Lengyel (2 Sept. 1914), op. cit., p. 1309. Mrs. Bölöni also noticed the voice of the betrayed lover regarding Ignóty: his words are as naive, she claimed, as those sulky words of a college boy addressing the idealized young lady. Diary of Itóka Bölöni, 9 August 1914, *Holmi*, 2014, No. 11, p. 1300. Her diary notes stress the important role of ego-documents as platforms of private opinions in times of censorship and of ‘spiral of silence’. A ‘spiral of silence’ – a terminus technicus of media theory – means members of community fear isolation due to their differing individual opinions.

45. Jeffrey Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914. Militarism, Myth and Mobilization in Germany*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 79. Eds., “A szövetség” [The Alliance], *Világ*, No. 188, 8 August 1914, p. 1.

46. Anonymous, “Francia áruk bojkottja” [The boycott of French products], *Világ*, No. 189, 9 August 1914, p. 11.

47. Ignóty, “Szabadságharc” [War of Liberation], *Világ*, No. 187, 7 August 1914, p. 1-2. Ignóty, “A cárizmus” [The Tsarism], *Világ*, No. 182, 2 August 1914, p. 5-6; Eds., «Háború a békéért» [War for Peace], *Világ*, No. 184, 4 August 1914, p. 1.

48. Marco [László Márkus], “Följegyzések” [Notes], *Új Nemzedék*, No. 35, 23 August 1914, p. 3.

1917, István Milotay, editor-in-chief of *Új Nemzedék*, confronted *Világ* with its early anti-French sentiments.⁴⁹ It was noted that anti-Romanian and anti-Serbian sentiments had been missing completely in *Világ*, proving its anti-patriotism—but such a remark was nothing short of a projection of the 1917 image of the enemy to the period of August 1914. At that time, *Világ* was equally characterized by Anti-French and anti-Russian sentiments, but anti-British and anti-Serbian sentiments nevertheless came in second.⁵⁰ Romanians, as I have already mentioned, were not yet a war enemy of Hungarians in 1914.

Despite the lack of a rigorous censorship until 1916, it became increasingly difficult to express disapproval of conformist views. Self-censorship became widespread among intellectuals, particularly during the first months. Those who tried to defend France and French culture on a democratic and liberal basis during the first months were more low-key and raised their voice, not without ambivalence, in *Nyugat*, the autonomous literary review, and, to a lesser extent, in the daily *Világ*. Some of these voices tended to articulate a moderate criticism of political France in order to come to the defense of French intellectual culture. György Bölöni, senior fellow at *Világ* and art critic, presented France—by calling it “the teacher of human thinking”⁵¹ and “an awakener of the human consciousness of Europe”—as the victim “of tetchy politicians.” Thanks to the diary of his wife, Ilona Bölöni—journalist and translator—we know that the assassination of Jean Jaurès tormented him, revealing that he more particularly condemned the nationalist turn of French politics.⁵² Mrs. Bölöni herself was devastated to hear about the brutalities of the French authorities against Austro-Hungarian citizens on French soil:

When I heard about brutalities in Paris, it was as if the warmest feelings of my soul had been whipped fiercely. I cannot believe this inhumanity about the most beautiful and perfect town in terms of humanity.⁵³

Her diary notes clearly reveal the extremely delicate situation of universalist Francophiles at the beginning of WWI. While supporting the war goals of their country,⁵⁴ the Bölöni couple—Ilona in her diary, György in his articles and both of them in their correspondence with Anatole France (whose Ilona was a secretary before WWI), expressed a “moving testimony of the fact that (intellectual) connections were dropped because of the war”⁵⁵—manifesting explicitly or

49. Ed., “Még egyszer a véres tollról” [Once again on the Bloody Pen], *Új Nemzedék*, No. 22, 3 June 1917, p. 346-347.

50. Gyöngyvér Czere, *Világ (1910-1926). Repertórium (1913-1914)*, Budapest, PIM, 1988, p. 283-297.

51. György Bölöni, “Jaurès”, *Világ*, No. 182, 2 August 1914, p. 9-10.

52. Diary of Itóka Bölöni (1 August 1914), op. cit., p. 1298.

53. Ibid., p. 1300 (5 August 1914).

54. See for example Ibid., (12 and 14 August 1914), p. 1302-1303.

55. On 3 Sept. 1914, the Bölönis wrote a letter full of sadness and fidelity to Anatole France: “quoiqu’il arrive en Hongrie, on lira toujours Anatole France, et Paris restera toujours la plus belle ville du monde.” However this letter only reached its recipient in 1919, along with another expressing hopes to renew their friendship despite the world war. (Quoted by Nicolas Bauquet, *les Francophiles hongrois entre nationalisme et occidentalisme 1896-1914*, Mémoire de maîtrise d’histoire, Université Paris I, 1999, p. 186).

implicitly a still existing admiration of universalist France and Anatole France, the incarnation of the latter.

Opposing great French (intellectual) culture to low French politics was a typical technique of Hungarian universalist Francophiles to explicitly blame French nationalism and at the same time stress their still intact cultural Franco-philía at the beginning of WWI, revealing their authors' old feelings for Paris. (Ignotus also used in *Világ* the same technique in one of his articles separating political Russia and modern Russian literature by claiming that the latter had to be preserved.⁵⁶) In September 1914, in the literary review *Nyugat*, Miksa Fenyő, writer and co-founder of *Nyugat*, paradoxically declared his love for France and French culture.⁵⁷ The poet Endre Ady, a Francophile and a partisan of universalism whose name epitomized poetic modernism, warned against condemning France unconditionally in the conflict: fed by the Dreyfusard tradition, Ady contrasted the "ugliness and idiocy" of France to the "French genius" embodied in his eyes by Anatole France, the writer most quoted in *Nyugat* before the war.⁵⁸ In November, he described Paris as "a mundane lady strangled by her pimp," and reappraised it as a "female" city and the "New Athens," embodying universalism, in a France that had resigned its universal purpose.⁵⁹ In May 1915, Paris meant for him surviving the war.⁶⁰ So Ady chose to create an antagonism between the country and its capital to preserve his love for French culture seen as universalist, but his articles did not end in controversies (in September 1914 he assured Ignotus that he understood why he had buried Paris). In November 1914 in *Új Nemzedék*, Lajos Kassák—founder of the first Hungarian avant-garde journal a year later, which became energetically anti-militarist—recalled his trips before 1914 to France and Germany by claiming explicitly that "the nicer memory was Germany."⁶¹ He described Germany as an empire complemented by "citizen socialism" and where the whole country is a huge united family. Similarly to Ady, he contrasted Paris as a center of literature and arts with the French countryside where, according to him, people remained excessively ignorant, a fact which was long hidden from Hungarian "Paris-lovers"—he stressed. However, he emphasized that Paris—open to all nations—

56. Ignotus, "Háború és béke" [War and Peace], *Világ*, No. 213, 2 Sept. 1914, p. 1.

57. Miksa Fenyő, "1914", *Nyugat*, No. 18-19, 16 Sept.-1 Oct. 1914, p. 321.

58. Endre Ady, "Vigasztaló Anatole France" [The consoling A. France], *Nyugat*, No. 16-17, 16 August-1 Sept. 1914, p. 267-268.

59. Endre Ady, "Levelek Madame Prétéríte-höz" [Letters to Mme Prétéríte], *Nyugat*, No. 22, 16 Nov. 1914, p. 461. A similar image with an opposite connotation was used by Thomas Mann in *Neue Rundschau*. Thomas Mann's words were evoked by Zoltán Ambrus on the 1 Febr. 1915. (See Zoltán Ambrus, "Háborús jegyzetek. Írók a háborúról" [War Notes. Writers on the War], *Nyugat*, No. 3, 1 Febr. 1915, p. 117).

60. Endre Ady, "Kis párizsi emlékezés. Levél Szép Ernőnek" [A little memory from Paris. Letter to Ernő Szép], *Nyugat*, No. 9, 1 May 1915, p. 516.

61. Lajos Kassák, "Egy csavargó noteszkönyvéből. (A német és francia csavargó-világ)" [From the Notebook of a Vagabond. The French and German Worlds of Vagabonds], *Új Nemzedék*, No. 45, 1 Nov. 1914, p. 8-9.

received them “loudly, with a big hug.”⁶² Less than one year later, in July 1915, another writer of *Nyugat*, Zoltán Ambrus, already saw that the conflict would freeze Franco-Hungarian cultural relations in the long run: “it is over for a long time that we visit Paris every now and then.”⁶³

TECHNIQUES FOR DESCRIBING THE FRENCH-GERMAN KULTURWAR

More particularly in *Világ* (and in many other press and periodicals, too), several ways of describing the French-German Kulturwar were perceptible. A typical means of reformulating French-German antagonism was to contrast German “science” (rationality and force)—corresponding to Kultur—to French “literature” and “arts” (imagination)—corresponding to *Civilization*.⁶⁴ The journalist Ödön Gerő of *Világ* stressed, by referring to Kant, the Germans’ sense of duty that distinguished them from the French, victims of their own imagination, instincts and impressions.⁶⁵ A similar argument appeared in German descriptions of French civilization in WWI. Ignotus stressed the antagonism of a young Germany where knowledge is shared by members of the society more than in France. Germans were typically organized, ready for action and prepared to make sacrifices, which looked much more important in war than literature, arts and so forth.⁶⁶ A very similar argument appeared in the liberal-conservative literary weekly *Új Idők*, too. Zoltán Szász, a liberal journalist and writer at the daily *Pesti Hírlap* and an occasional contributor to *Új Idők*, published several essays on Germany. However, the first reveals Szász’s old feelings on France in his praise of the complementary nature of the relationship between Germans and Hungarians, who could find mutual benefits:

Luckily enough, *everything that a nation can learn from another*, any type of organization, exists in an exemplary way among the Germans, but everything it cannot learn, such as physical and spiritual maturity, exists in large parts at home [i.e. Hungary]. The Hungarian spirit and the German spirit can blend in a very fortunate way. Our alliance with the Germans is not only political, but deeper: it is a great alliance in a *cultural* sense.⁶⁷

Szász’s words were paradoxically close to those of French intellectuals on German Kultur. According to a widespread generalization in France, German

62. Id., “Egy csavargó noteszkönyvéből II” [From the Notebook of a Vagabond], *Új Nemzedék*, No. 47, 15 Nov. 1914, p. 8-10.

63. Zoltán Ambrus, “Háborús jegyzetek. Mi lesz a háború után?” [War Notes. What’s going to happen after the conflict?], *Nyugat*, No. 14, 16 July 1915, p. 753.

64. Eds., “Diadalok útján” [On the Road of Triumphs], *Világ*, No. 202, 22 August 1914, p. 1-2 (quotation: p. 1).

65. Gerő Ödön, “Vérvirágok” [Bloody flowers], *Világ*, No. 217, 6 Sept. 1914, p. 1-2 (quotation: p. 2).

66. Ignotus, “A német” [The German], *Világ*, No. 217, 6 Sept. 1914, p. 1-3.

67. Zoltán Szász, “Németség és magyarság” [Germans and Hungarians], *Új Idők*, No. 42, 11 Oct. 1914, p. 384-385 (quotation: p. 385). Translation of quotations in every case are mine.

Kultur was “fertile in the material realm [but] fruitless in the intellectual order.”⁶⁸ This commonplace appearing in energetically pro-war press goes back to early 19th century French-German debates and was reinterpreted in the context of WWI.⁶⁹ Szász, who, as a pre-war Francophile, spoke French, returned to French clichés on *Kultur* dating back to Mme de Staël’s famous writings on the appreciation of “Northern culture” and of Germany.⁷⁰ These rather sophisticated views were recycled in an oversimplified and reversed form by the French in WWI to contrast the “French genius” to “Teutonic pedantries” (with the more or less latent intention to prove that *Kultur* was at the root of German atrocities).⁷¹ Szász combined these views with the “1914 ideas,” developed by German thinkers like Werner Sombart during WWI and massively transferred into Hungary.⁷² Interestingly, as Szász summed up the differences between the Germans and the Hungarians, in the above comparison he actually replaced the French with Hungarians as the creative genius—a gesture that revealed his own ties with France. Szász’s case proves that even praise for German culture during WWI could turn out to be a telltale sign of implicit attachment to French culture.

Another typical argument in *Világ* (and in other journals too) claimed that the war was for preserving enemies’ cultures from self-destruction. This argument, they thought, worked particularly well with regard to Western European enemies. Many articles stressed that unlike the Entente, Hungarians (and Germans) were tolerant regarding enemies’ cultures:

It is no small detail that it does matter to our enemies whether or not we stay alive, because our life protects them from ruining themselves and we are preserving their life protecting ideas—the very ideas they themselves abandoned. We are the country of Voltaire and Renan and that of Stuart Hill and Herbert Spencer.⁷³

As a reaction to German advances in France, in an article on 10 September 1914 entitled “At the gates of Paris,” Ignotus literally begged for the preservation of French culture, now in bad hands, and proposed to patronize it like a child.⁷⁴ On the model of the German war press, he claimed that contrary to the total destruction of Russians and the humiliation of the English, which were war goals of Germany and its allies, the French only needed to be taught a lesson.⁷⁵ He

68. Anne Rasmussen, Christophe Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie. Les intellectuels et la Première Guerre mondiale (1910-1919)*, Paris, La Découverte, 1996, p. 207.

69. For the meaning of *Kultur* see for example Roger Chickering, *Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914-1918*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 134.

70. See for example Michel Espagne, *le Paradigme de l'étranger. Les chaires de littérature étrangère au XIX^e siècle*, Paris, Cerf, 1993, p. 7-8.

71. Rasmussen, Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie*, op. cit., p. 134-135.

72. See for example: “Sombart válaszol Shaw-nak” [Sombart’s response to Shaw], *Világ*, No. 221, 10 Sept. 1914, p. 7; Andor Halasi, “Angol diplomácia” [English diplomacy], *A Hét*, No. 26, 27 June 1915, p. 336-337; anonymous, “Sombart úr megfenyegetése” [Menacing Mr Sombart], *Huszadik Század*, No. 4-5, May 1915, p. 289.

73. Ignotus, “István napjára” [To István’s Day], *Világ*, No. 200, 20 August 1914, p. 1-2 (quotation: p. 2).

74. Ignotus, “Páris előtt” [At the gates of Paris], *Világ*, No. 221, 10 Sept. 1914, p. 1-2.

75. Pity for A. France was a widespread topic in the German war press in the first months. (See anonymous, “Nyílt level Anatole France-hoz” [Open letter to A. France], art. cit.).

also hoped that France could return to the top of the European continent where “it is geographically destined.” Paradoxically, the more Paris fell, the more the idea of a Federation of European Empires was realistic since the German occupation of Paris would make peace. Such a claim for moral ownership would be quite frequent during the first years by Hungarian writers, scientists and intellectuals with the intention to dismiss the accusations of “barbarism” plaguing Hungary and their allies and to implicitly help their own Francophilia or Anglophilia survive.⁷⁶ In Hungary, a similar moral ownership was claimed for Shakespeare too,⁷⁷ and similar techniques can be noticed also with some French intellectuals claiming moral ownership of Kant and Goethe.⁷⁸ Evidently, this sort of argument was published alongside explicitly aggressive ones arousing the hatred of enemy countries.⁷⁹

Another widespread technique was gendering the French-German antagonism. The writer of Aesthetic style Dezső Kosztolányi, in his article on Maurice Maeterlinck, both feminized France and Belgium and masculinized Germany.⁸⁰ This explicit gender approach to the French-German antagonism was rooted more particularly in the German “1914 ideas”, the new war nationalism and its values of manhood and strength as represented by a young German culture. The same Dezső Kosztolányi would translate and publish in December 1914 the poem *Hassgesang gegen England* by Ernst Lissauer referring to this very same young German culture and hatred in war.⁸¹ Gendering of the French-German Kulturwar also appeared in Catholic and liberal-conservative journals; some articles in *Magyar Figyelő* emphasized, for example, French weakness and femininity in comparison to “young and masculine” Germans on the model of the “1914 ideas” – “a vaguely defined set of cultural assertions about German wartime identity.”⁸² These ideas rejected the heritage of 1789 and emphasized idealism, self-sacrifice and community. The “1914 ideas” were transmitted to Hungary mainly via the thoughts and works of Werner Sombart, including *Händler und Helden*⁸³.

More particularly literary journals, where articles combined Francophilia with nationalism before the conflict, as WWI broke out, felt obliged to manifest their turn away from French culture by emphasizing its low-class character in a racist way. According to *Új Idők*, French civilization unmasked itself in the

76. See for example Eszter Balázs, “War Stares at Us like an Ominous Sphinx”, op. cit., p. 99-100.

77. Ibid., p. 100-102.

78. Martha Hanna, *The Mobilization of Intellect. French Scholars and Writers during the Great War*, Cambridge – London, Harvard University Press, 1996, p. 106.

79. See for example: Ignóty, “Jegyzetek a nagy napokból” [Notes from the Great Days], *Világ*, No. 210, 30 August 1914, p. 5-7.

80. Dezső Kosztolányi, “A méhek” [Bees], *Világ*, No. 208, 28 August 1914, p. 1.

81. *A világháború képes krónikája* [The Illustrated Chronicle of the World War], Vol. 10, 13 Dec. 1914.

82. Prochasson, “Intellectuals and Writers”, in: John Horne (ed.), *A Companion to World War I*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2012, p. 326.

83. See footnote no. 72, in this paper.

conflict as “barbarian” by using colonial troops: it “showed itself as a Central African savage only listening to his instincts” – a reference on the basis of racism to barbaric colonial France, a proof of its inferiority in comparison with German Kultur. Similarly to *Új Idők*, another previously Francophile literary journal, *A Hét* (The Weekly) also accused French soldiers of cowardice at the beginning for hiding behind their colonial soldiers.⁸⁴ Sometimes, diaries could reveal an altering opinion: the general hatred in Hungarian press against colored people (in the enemy camp) – colonial soldiers as well as Japanese for example – was noticed with consternation in her diary by the journalist Laura Lengyel, contributor to the conservative daily *Budapesti Hírlap* (Journal of Budapest), close to the establishment.⁸⁵

The abovementioned *A Hét* – which had successfully blended French cultural orientation with nationalism for years before WWI and was edited mostly by assimilated, secular Jews, this time already close to the establishment – was particularly successful in expressing a hatred of French culture on a democratic basis. While catholic writers and intellectuals blamed France for betraying religion and morals, *A Hét* accused the French, on the contrary, of betraying its universalist ideals, leading naturally to an alliance with the despot Russia:

Is it possible that equality made alliance with whip, brotherhood with pogrom, and liberty with the prison guards of Siberia?⁸⁶

Ernő Lengyel, contributor to *A Hét* explained this by the still “Catholic, conservative and imperial” character of France and argued that Hungary fooled itself by creating a very different image of France, as “the works of antimilitarist poets used to be recited not in Paris, but in Budapest, Bucharest and Moscow.” Entering the war on the side of Russia is “betraying humanity,” a “grimace to Europe.”⁸⁷ France is defeated by the “diabolism, frivolity and corruption” of its sons.⁸⁸ So in *A Hét*, France was accused at the very beginning of betraying its democratic ideals by forming an alliance with the despot Tsarist power, and this remained the common denominator of the publication’s articles for years. Condemning Russia because of its despotism was widely shared by Central Powers’ leftist press as well as by all sorts of Jewish press.

84. Anonymous, untitled, *A Hét*, No. 35, 30 August 1914, p. 545.

85. Diary of Laura Lengyel (1 Sept. 1914), op. cit., p. 1308.

86. See for example Polonius [Ernő Lengyel], “Franciaország” is [Even France], *A Hét*, No. 32, 9 August 1914, p. 509.

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid., p. 510.

A CASE OF A NOTORIOUS CULTURAL GERMANOPHILE WRITER
BÉLA BALÁZS

In the eyes of a minority devoted to German culture and literature in Hungarian intellectual life, a war lead by Germany was only the next step, if not a logical one in the recent development process characterizing Germany's modernization efforts. Articles praising Germany and the Germans were significantly more numerous everywhere, including *Nyugat* where they only began to decrease from early 1915 on.⁸⁹

Béla Balázs was one of these few cultural Germanophiles among modernist writers before WWI.⁹⁰ Along with György Lukács, he attended the seminars of sociologist Georg Simmel in Germany. In the literary debates preceding the war, he was often criticized for his so-called "German" (incomprehensible) style. With György Lukács, he thought that German philosophy and literature had a regenerating force for Hungarian literature and culture, and that was why they attacked even *Nyugat* by condemning its *l'art pour l'art* and the "impressionism" of French style; in 1912 Lukács even wrote a pamphlet with the telling title "The Gallic Danger."⁹¹ When WWI broke out, unlike his friend Lukács who stayed in Germany and avoided conscription,⁹² Balázs had a short-lived military career; he enlisted as a volunteer during the first weeks of WWI and was soon wounded and demobilized in 1915. An early piece by him (August 1914 in *Nyugat*) was instrumental in initiating a polarization between "Germany" and "France" akin to an intellectual *war culture*. In his diary, he considered his own essay as a "declaration of war by an old ally of the Germans who had been attacked for years for writing like a German."⁹³ In Balázs's view, Weimar stood for "German culture" whereas Paris epitomized 'Latin culture' and they were struggling for European cultural hegemony. (The Franco-German cultural and intellectual rivalry was more particularly noticed by many European writers and intellectuals from the turn of the 19th-20th centuries, when Germany made a great breakthrough in various intellectual and cultural domains.⁹⁴) According to Balázs, "Paris was the first great [war] dead" in Hungary, where war had

89. See for example Zoltán Felvinczi Takács, "Új csataképek" [New Battlefield Paintings], *Nyugat*, No. 18-19, 16 Sept.-Oct. 1914, p. 338-339; Artúr Bárdos, "Német impérium" [German Empire], *Nyugat*, No. 22, 16 Nov. 1914, p. 506-508; Aladár Schöpflin, "Magyarok és Németek" [Hungarians and Germans], *Nyugat*, No. 3, 1 Febr. 1915, pp. 149-153.

90. Béla Balázs, *Napló, 1914-1922* [Journal, 1914-1922], Vol. 2, Budapest, Magvető, 1982, p. 9-10.

91. See on *The Gallic Danger*: Eszter Balázs, "La référence française dans le discours sur les 'lettres' en Hongrie, 1890 et 1914", *Cahiers du Centre de recherches historiques*, No. 31, April 2003, p. 61-78.

92. Mario D. Fenyo, "Literature and Political Change: Budapest, 1908-1918," *The American Philosophical Society*, Philadelphia, Vol. 77, Part 6, 1987, p. 69.

93. Béla Balázs, *Napló, 1914-1922*, op. cit., p. 23. As early as in 1912, he had contrasted German "discipline," "collective work" and "order" to French "bravoure," "geniality" and "individuality." (Béla Balázs, "Párisi levél. Bravúr és fegyelem" [Letter from Paris. Bravoure and discipline], *Világ*, No. 5, 6 Jan. 1912, p. 7-8.)

94. Rasmussen, Prochasson, *Au nom de la patrie*, op. cit., p. 132.

destroyed both political and cultural Francophilia.⁹⁵ Balázs's article was in line with his pre-war passion for German culture, in which he saw a rejuvenating force for Hungarian culture. However, he did not reject French culture as a whole, but only its "Latin" part. He praised certain French writers, like those around the NRF who represented, in his view, the German part of French culture. The NRF writers had been genuinely interested in German literature and philosophy, and since they not only enriched but even structured their reflection thanks to German intellectual trends, they can be considered as mediators of an "auto-construction of France by Germany."⁹⁶ Therefore this interest for Germany by NRF writers was noticed by Hungarian Béla Balázs who put it in a new frame, namely the Kulturwar frame during WWI.

According to Balázs, the German option should be all the more obvious for Hungarian writers because the "German book fair became the stock exchange of world literature" thanks to the Germans' cultural interest in other cultures. This idea of German Kultur's universalist ambition was rooted in 19th century German literary historians' ideas: Friedrich Schlegel and others over-valued literature (in the absence of a solid German political system) and, because of that, some of them, like Karl Rosenkranz, even developed the idea that German poetry was profound enough not to lose its individual character while absorbing foreign literatures.⁹⁷ This image of a literature strong enough not lose its specific character when absorbing foreign influences was also strongly widespread in Hungary and suited well the inclusivist model of nation statehood prevalent until WWI.

We also possess Balázs's diary notes of 2 August 1914, which were certainly the basis of the abovementioned publication, and thanks to that differences with his essay published by *Nyugat* can be identified.⁹⁸ A major difference is that, in the diary, he claimed to choose between Berlin and Paris (so he offered a political and not a cultural choice), and also made clear that, by choosing Berlin, he would opt for "internationalism" since there is hope for the Monarchy to transform itself from a multiethnic empire into socialist states. In this sense, Paris—culture of the shallow—represented "nationalism," while Berlin—culture of the profound—a hope for internationalism; in other words, pre-war culture vs. culture of the future:

95. After a more general and homogeneous Francophilia that had characterized all types of Hungarian elites of the late 19th century, two sorts of Francophilias – a political as well as a cultural one – appeared by the 1900s and a large part of political elites turned away from French politics. Bauquet, *les Francophiles hongrois entre nationalisme et occidentalisme 1896-1914*, op. cit.

96. Michel Espagne, "Problèmes d'histoire interculturelle", *Revue germanique internationale*, No. 4, 1995, p. 9. On NRF writers during WWI see Yaël Dagan, *la NRF entre guerre et paix*, Paris, Tallandier, 2008.

97. Michael Werner, "Histoire littéraire contre *Literaturgeschichte*. La genèse d'une vision historique de la littérature en France et en Allemagne pendant la première moitié du XIX^e siècle," *Genèses*, janvier 1994, p. 11-12.

98. After January 1915, *Nyugat* refused to continue releasing Balázs's bellicose war notes.

Paris meant the grinding of a nationalism that is already over-represented among Hungarians, the culture of the periphery for a people lacking the most “profoundness”; the cult of temperament for a country which will become poor due to its lack of organization and discipline. Berlin means the opposite. The otherness of the German spirit is in fact reassuring: it guarantees that they could never absorb us Hungarians.⁹⁹

The words chosen by Balázs in his diary betrayed old stereotypes on the French-German cultural dichotomy he crossed with the image of a most recent dichotomy (since around 1900) between “nationalism” and “internationalism.” But finally, as we can see, he opted in his essay for a cultural choice he thought fitted better with the general image in Hungary of a French-German Kulturwar.

HUNGARIAN WRITERS’ OWN CONTROVERSIES REGARDING FRENCH WAR NATIONALISM AND FRENCH CULTURE

Sometimes, judging the French war nationalism could be in the subject of polemics between different writers’ and intellectuals’ camps. In May 1915, Károly Burján, a caustic pen in the Catholic *Magyar Kultúra*, instead of taking sides when Reims cathedral was destroyed in October 1914 (which could indeed have been a difficult task for a *Hungarian* Catholic as it was about the destruction of a *French* church), accused *Nyugat* of hypocrisy for shedding crocodile tears for Reims a couple of months before.¹⁰⁰ In his view, it was hypocritical on the part of the “cosmopolitan” *Nyugat* to condemn the destruction of a Christian cathedral, as the journal itself took part in the destruction of Christian culture before the war. In reality, Ignotus had published the poem *La cathédrale* by Edmond Rostand in *Nyugat*, adding a footnote that criticized precisely French intellectuals’ *war culture*. Rostand was compared by Ignotus to Tyrteus, a war poet of Ancient Greek times who became a symbol of the war-monger intellectual in Hungary and in other European countries during WWI.¹⁰¹ So neither Catholic nor autonomist writers in *Nyugat* condemned the destruction of the cathedral of Reims—a French church and a famous European monument—by the Germans. Instead, Catholics interpreted the publication of this poem by Rostand as a betrayal of the Hungarian patriotic cause by writers of *Nyugat*, while, in reality, the latter condemned Rostand for his *war culture* in making Reims a symbol of French martyrdom.

The only genuine controversy about presumed cultural roots of French *war culture* took place in *Nyugat* between two pre-war Francophiles who had attended the College Eötvös, a calque of the *École normale supérieure*.¹⁰² In

99. Béla Balázs, *Napló, 1914-1922*, op. cit., p. 6-7 (quotation: p. 7).

100. B. K. [Károly Burján], “Nyugatosok zavaros tépelődései” [Penisevenness of *Nyugat* Writers], *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 9, 5 May 1915, p. 414-415.

101. “Edmond Rostand, *La cathédrale*,” *Nyugat*, No. 21, 1 Nov. 1914, p. 440.

102. See on Szabó and Laczkó’s activities during the ‘golden age’ of College Eötvös: Imre Szabics, “Az Eötvös Collegium és az *École Normale Supérieure*,” in: László Varga (ed.), *Az Eötvös Collegium és a magyar irodalomtörténet. Tanulmányok* [The College Eötvös and Literary History], Budapest, Argumentum, 2003, p. 117-121.

January 1915, *Nyugat* published an article entitled “The cross-section of the French soul” by Géza Laczkó, who condemned the French and French mentalité in an offensive tone.¹⁰³ Although his discourse was not rooted in any Germanophilia, it was quite similar to points made by the German press railing against French and English individualism. Laczkó portrayed the French as self-ish in essence, placing individual interests above the community. Unlike Balázs, he did not seek to distinguish a “Latin” part from a “German” one that could be saved, thus expressing a radical dismissal of the culture that once used to inspire his thoughts. One of the reasons why Laczkó, a pre-war Francophile, turned against France was that he was horrified at the internment of his friend, the writer Aladár Kuncz, on French soil (noted in his diary).¹⁰⁴ His diary attests how he was gradually radicalized during autumn and winter 1914—just before publishing his infamous essay.

The modernist writer Dezső Szabó—whose anti-Semite turn happened only a couple of years later, expressed in *Elsodort falu* (1918) [Village swept away]—responded to his friend’s article in the column ‘Disputa’ of *Nyugat* by accusing Laczkó of portraying France in a way that was biased and a betrayal of their own youth.¹⁰⁵ At the end of his response he claimed that, rather than killing enemies, one must kill the possibility to have enemies. Very soon he got back to the question of “French soul” in *Huszadik Század*, the leftist intellectual review where—similarly to Laczkó—he gave an analysis of French mentalité but using more sophisticated descriptions of French classicism and raison (seen as essential characteristics of French culture), in the manner of many French scholars and artists of the Great War.¹⁰⁶ He claimed that the individualism, and more particularly German individualism, that “preceded the 420 millimeter mortars” during the current world war, had been fatal to the concentrated and reasonably built French culture. “Individualistic democracy” also weakened France, causing the “decadence of the community,” while individualism changed Germany for the better. These words led to his break with individualism in his next writings in *Nyugat*. However, still in his response to the reproach of Laczkó, he stressed that France had always been “the laboratory of ideas” and still was, with a powerful force to teach other peoples.

103. Géza Laczkó, “A francia lélek keresztmetszete” [The Cross-Section of the French Soul], *Nyugat*, No. 1, 1 Jan. 1915, p. 24-27.

104. He first mentioned in August 1914 that his friend ‘Dadi’ was detained as a prisoner of war in France. (Diary of Géza Laczkó, i. m., p. 1314.) Kuncz is author of postwar *Black Monastery*, a roman inspired by his internment in France.

105. Dezső Szabó, “A francia lélek keresztmetszete” [The Cross-Section of the French Soul], *Nyugat*, No. 3, 1 Feb. 1915, p. 168.

106. Dezső Szabó, “A francia pszichéhez” [To the French Psyché], *Huszadik Század*, No.1, Jan. 1915, p. 38-44. See also Martha Hanna, *The Mobilization of Intellect*, op. cit., p. 142-143.

A COMMON TARGET OF CULTURAL ANTI-FRENCH SENTIMENTS
OF ALL SORTS: ANATOLE FRANCE

Anatole France became a common scapegoat for Hungarian writers and intellectuals who aroused hatred, fear and disdain around him as well as self-hatred for being an intellectual. Every literary journal published negative articles on him for a while.

During the pre-war years in Hungary, Anatole France had been the most popular contemporary French writer: thanks to his philosophy and style, he was particularly popular with modernist and progressive writers and intellectuals who saw him as an incarnation of liberalism, humanism and rational skepticism.¹⁰⁷ As an important first publication on in late August 1914 in *Világ*, Ignotus described France, who remained silent, as taking part—on the wrong side this time—in the new Dreyfus affair the war represented. (Comparing WWI to the Dreyfus affair was widespread in France.) Once a Socialist, now a nationalist, his case proves “the fortunate automatism of the intellect” according to Ignotus:

In this major Dreyfus trial of educated people, no doubts, he is supporting the Paty du Clams and the Eszterházys. Can you imagine that? That’s right. Our times are much like the times of the Dreyfus trial: you simply *have to* belong somewhere. The only difference being one has no choice, one simply cannot consider whose side to take. No doubt, a Frenchman can be nothing but—French.¹⁰⁸

However, as early as October 1914—when Anatole France was attacked by the French patriot press for his open letter advocating moderation and humanity for the Germans—the same *Világ* dedicated an editorial to celebrating his faithfulness to humanist values. He was described as a rebel against impartiality, “a small island in French bias.”¹⁰⁹ A couple of days later the same journal reported without any comments that France wanted to join the army and stop writing. France’s volunteering in the French army in October 1914 as an aged man and a famous writer was widely covered by the European press as a public manifestation of support for the French war effort.¹¹⁰ In order to update Anatole France’s image in Hungary on the German model, the daily *Pesti Napló* even translated and published a letter by an anonymous German writer to Anatole

107. Eszter Balázs, “En tête des intellectuels” : les écrivains hongrois et la question de la liberté et de l’autonomie littéraires (1908-1914). Doctoral thesis, EHESS-ELTE, 2008, p. 194-200. The book version was published in Hungarian: Eszter Balázs, “*Az intellektualitás vezérei.*” *Viták a Nyugatban és a Nyugatról*, 1908-1914. [At the head of Intellectuals. Polemics in *Nyugat* and on *Nyugat*, 1908-1914], Napvilág, Budapest, 2009.

108. Ignotus, “Itthon” [At home], *Világ*, No. 203, 23 August 1914, p. 2.

109. Anonymous, “Anatol (!) France szomorú,” *Világ*, No. 246, 4 Oct. 1914, p. 1-2.

110. See for example: anonymous, “Anatole France katonának ajánlkozik” [Anatole France volunteering], *Budapesti Hírlap*, No. 248, 7 Oct. 1914, p. 110. However, only *Világ* stressed that Anatole France felt forced to join the army after being attacked because of a newspaper article in which he expressed hope to make friendship with the Germans after the conflict. (see anonymous, “Anatol (!) France szomorú,” art. cit.)

France accusing the “French intellectual aristocracy”, including France himself, of remaining silent while the French press was full of hatred of Germany.¹¹¹

He could become a target even in *Nyugat*, where he had been the most quoted foreign author before the world war broke out¹¹²: in January 1915, Zoltán Ambrus, a novelist celebrated for his “French style” before the conflict, complained that the French writer, despite being an excellent novelist, lacked objectivity.¹¹³ As we can see, his image was, however, complex among *Nyugat* writers thanks to Ady, for example, who continued to admire him. On the other hand, the economist Tibor Vadnay stressed in the liberal-conservative *Magyar Figyelő* that France, who used to be known for his compassion and humanism, had disdained French glory before the conflict and spread decadence.¹¹⁴ For the Catholic *Magyar Kultúra*, he was the embodiment of the perfect anti-values: a decadent, a Frenchman and a “Freemason writer”.¹¹⁵ This labeling successfully linked the inner and the exterior enemies for the Catholic monthly as, since its beginnings in 1913, Freemasons had been its main target (until 1916, anti-Semitism had been less exposed than the hatred of Freemasons).

Nevertheless, during the first months it was quite frequent to quote enemy writers even in the energetically pro-war periodicals, close to the inner circles of the government. In a period of scarce information—news from the battlefield was strictly censored—quoting them was an attempt to understand the mechanism of war and predict how the current conflict would continue. Contemporaries also hoped that these enemy writers involuntarily unmasked the true nature of their own nation in their writings.¹¹⁶ Quoting Anatole France, Rudyard Kipling or Arthur Conan Doyle for this purpose was also—paradoxically—a way of acknowledging these writers as intellectual beacons in war descriptions, despite the fact that they all publicly supported the war effort of their respective country.¹¹⁷

So in almost every literary journal and many dailies of 1914–1915, regardless of their political or intellectual agenda, Anatole France remained a key figure of French literature. His war representations varied more according to individuals than to journals and his image also changed in the course of the war. In the

111. Anonymous, “Nyílt level Anatole France-hoz” [Open letter to Anatole France], *Pesti Napló*, No. 273, 1 Nov. 1914, p. 22–24.

112. Eszter Balázs, “En tête des intellectuels,” op. cit., p. 194.

113. Ambrus Zoltán, “Háborús jegyzetek. Írók a háborúról” [War Notes. Writers on the War], art. cit., p. 116–119.

114. Tibor Vadnay, “Háború és Béke” [War and Peace], *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 23, 1 Dec. 1914, p. 379–380; Gyula Pekár, “Nemzeti értékek a világháborúban” [National values in World War], *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 12, 16 June 1915, p. 432–443.

115. -k. [Erő Császár], “Anatole France,” *Magyar Kultúra*, No. 18, 20 Nov. 1914, p. 365.

116. See, for example, Tibor Vadnay, “Háború és béke” [War and Peace], art. cit., p. 370, 380; anonymous, “Rudyard Kipling az angolokról” [Kipling on the English], *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 1, 1 Jan. 1915, p. 153.

117. Rainer Taub, A szellemek háborúja [War of Spirits], in: Stephan Burgdorff, Klaus Wiegrefe (eds.), *Az első világháború. A XX. század őskatasztrófiája* [WWI. The Original Catastrophe of the 20th Century], Budapest, Napvilág, 2010, p. 47.

liberal-conservative review *Magyar Figyelő* in May 1915, he was also quoted as opposing the war as well as the French-Russian alliance in the past.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless, Hungarian writers and journalists were aware of the fact that Anatole France contributed patriotic pieces for *Le Petit Parisien* during the Great War and contrasted the courageous French soldiers with the German “barbarians.”¹¹⁹ In the conservative daily *Budapesti Hírlap*, the journalist Ilona Gyulai attempted to rehabilitate him in summer 1915 (*The French War Literature*),¹²⁰ while early 1916 the same journal reported Károly Sebestyén’s words still criticizing him for arousing hatred against Germany.¹²¹ Mária Szende reviewed France’s *Sur la voie glorieuse* (1915)–the volume where his anti-German sentiments were exhibited–in the progressive sociologist periodical *Huszadik Század*, stressing her disappointment as to the weakness of French political liberty, illustrated by the writer’s very ideas and comportment.¹²² His ambivalent reception did not impede his popularity among the larger Hungarian readership: the caustic pen of the eclectic *Új Nemzedék*, László Márkus, even noticed a popular breakthrough of A. France’s novels in Hungary by 1917, raising the example of his own maid, whose bedside reading was one of these novels.¹²³ In comparison with Anatole France, Romain Rolland had a more balanced and significantly more positive image during WWI: the Hungarian press discovered him after summer 1915 mainly as a target of the French warmonger press and literary critique. On the logic of “the critic of my enemy is my friend,” he soon became the most popular French writer in the Hungarian literary and mass press, worthy of a separate study.¹²⁴

FADING ANTI-FRENCH SENTIMENTS

Emergence of contradictory images of Anatole France and even his partial rehabilitation as well as the complex but generally positive representations of Romain Rolland illustrated greater changes as well: finally, in the course of the

118. Occidentalis [?], Anatole France az orosz-francia szövetségről [A. France on the French-Russian Alliance], *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 10, 16 May 1915, p. 306-309. This had been mentioned previously by *Világ*: Eds., “A cár ellen” [Against the Tsar], *Világ*, No. 264, Oct. 22 1914, p. 8.

119. Anonymous, “Anatole France egykor – és most” [Anatole France now – and before], *Budapesti Hírlap*, No. 106, 17 April 1915, p. 9. See also David Drake, *French Intellectuals and Politics from the Dreyfus Affair to the Occupation*, New York, Palgrave, 2005, p. 58.

120. Ilona Gyulai, “Háborús francia irodalom” [French war literature], *Budapesti Hírlap*, No. 235, 24 August 1915, p. 1-2.

121. “Conference of Károly Sebestyén,” *Budapesti Hírlap*, No. 36, 5 Feb. 1916, p. 588.

122. Mária Szende Lukácsné, “A háborús Anatole France” [A. France in war], *Huszadik Század*, No. 3, March 1916, p. 214-218.

123. ml. [László Márkus], “A magyarok könyvei” [Hungarians’ Books], *Új Nemzedék*, No. 48-49, 3 December 1917, p. 749.

124. See a rough presentation of Tibor Frank: “Romain Rolland és magyar fogadtatása az I. világháborúban” [Romain Rolland and his Hungarian reception in WWI] in: Béla Kálmán Borsi (ed.), *Homályzónák: felvilágosodás és liberalizmus. Tanulmányok Kecskeméti Károly 80. születésnapjára* [Areas of shadow: enlightenment and liberalism. Studies for Charles Kecskeméti’s 80th birthday], Budapest, Sík, 2013, p. 205-212.

war, anti-French sentiments in the literary press and in the mass press were replaced, on one hand, by new targets of hatred and, on the other, by new interpretations of France and the French. In *Nyugat* in particular and in other periodicals, proponents of the democratization of the country, after an eruption of an ambivalent hate campaign against France and French culture in August 1914 and during the following weeks and months, there were far fewer writers and intellectuals who continued discussing France and its cultural life within the *war culture* frame. After summer 1915, many contributors to *Nyugat* expressed only empathy for soldiers and, with a few exceptions, no longer aroused hatred of the enemy. This also proves that, despite a considerable loss of its autonomy and liberty of speech, the most important modernist literary magazine did not become a proper intellectual platform for the national war cause. Moreover, because of the perseverance of the French on the Western Front and because of the enormous cruelty of the war experienced by every nation involved in WWI, more and more Hungarian writers and intellectuals preferred to take a more detached position. There were moments, however, when a new wave of patriotic enthusiasm appeared in the literary press. But these moments were also moments of new hatred. After Italy joined WWI on the side of the Entente in May 1915, bringing a Central European character¹²⁵ to the conflict (at least in the Eastern part of the European war theatre), the instrumentalization of French culture and literature for geopolitical purposes decreased significantly. At the moment of the Verdun battles in summer 1916, French front heroism was even praised but articles stressed at the same time that the French had no choice but to surrender: the writer Kálmán Csathó, in the liberal-conservative *Magyar Figyelő*, claimed that anybody for whom the French culture was important was watching their efforts with compassion but also added that French were still characterized by the fantasy they could defeat the Germans.¹²⁶ Moreover, a Catholic French language teacher noted, regarding Verdun, that again “one can talk about our enemies, if not with the same old sympathy as before the war, at least with the same old objectivity.”¹²⁷

The hatred against French culture could be directly shifted to other enemy cultures, too. Another crucial moment was when, in autumn 1916, Romania entered the war supporting the Entente and attacking Transylvania. In *Magyar Figyelő*, the writer Ferenc Herczeg claimed that the time of hatred had come for “the good Hungarians who never could hate.”¹²⁸ The fact that Hungarian borders were at risk made authors of the Catholic weekly *Élet*, an anti-French warmonger

125. Catherine Horel, “L’Europe centrale dans le ‘concert européen’,” *Actes du colloque franco-hongrois Balaton, Őr Kontinens*, Budapest, ELTE, 2005, p. 9-20, p. 12.

126. Kálmán Csathó, “A legyőzhetetlen franciák” [The invincible French], *Magyar Figyelő*, No. 14, 16 July 1916, p. 143-144.

127. Béla Petrich, “Jegyzetek a franciák háborújához” [Notes for the French’s war], *Katolikus Szemle*, 1916, No. 7, p. 702.

128. Eds. [Herczeg Ferenc], Erdély [Transylvania], *Magyar Figyelő*, 1916, Vol. 3, p. 465.

from the beginning of WWI, turn away from France explicitly towards new enemies (Romanians and Hungarian Jews). Moreover, editor-in-chief József Andor described the French as “the nicest of our enemies who know the purpose they fight for.”¹²⁹ By recognizing the achievements of French patriotism (bravery and heroism) and new religious fervor, the Catholic author also hoped that the war would bring about “a Christian France” since the war was started by French Freemasons, but fought finally by the French “popular spirit.” At the same time, however, the social democratic writer József Diner-Dénes published an article in the Austrian *Arbeiter-Zeitung* entitled *Deutsche Kultur—ungarische Kulture* and noted that not even the current war could change “the French character of modern Hungarian literature.”¹³⁰

CONCLUSION

For Hungarian writers and intellectuals, condemning French culture was a means to defend the symbolic frontiers of the Hungarian part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy during 1914-1915. This delimitation of French culture was strongest during the first weeks and months of WWI, when a rapid victory of the Germans was taken for granted on the Western Front. This was also because many of these writers and intellectuals were not actually enlisted (they had more opportunities in Austria-Hungary to avoid enlistment than other social groups), they preferred to make war on the cultural field and turned against France and French culture. More particularly at the beginning of the conflict, many of them rejected—together with their individualism and/or aestheticism—, their cultural Francophilia. Nevertheless, the readership, mainly in Budapest, did not necessarily follow their prominent writers and intellectuals: they did not reject French writers and in the long run read especially those not discussing wars. Generally, Hungarian public opinion was more turned against Serbia and Russia and, later on, Italy and Romania. And as World War I went on, hatred of French culture decreased significantly in the mass press and in literary journals, so a full and long-term cultural protection was not attempted.

129. Sz.- [József Andor], “A franciák” [The French], *Élet*, No. 41, 8 Oct. 1916, p. 359.

130. See the review of his article in *Irodalomtörténet*, No. 1-2, 1916, p. 306-307.